

2000]22E40

**PROPERTY (RD) FOR COCOMPACT LATTICES IN A FINITE
PRODUCT OF RANK ONE LIE GROUPS WITH SOME RANK
TWO LIE GROUPS**

INDIRA CHATTERJI

ABSTRACT. We apply V. Lafforgue's techniques to establish property (RD) for cocompact lattices in a finite product of rank one Lie groups with Lie groups whose restricted root system is of type A_2 .

We recall that a *length function* on a discrete group Γ is a function $\ell : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbf{R}_+$ such that the neutral element is mapped to zero, and such that $\ell(\gamma) = \ell(\gamma^{-1})$, $\ell(\gamma\mu) \leq \ell(\gamma) + \ell(\mu)$ for any $\gamma, \mu \in \Gamma$. A discrete group Γ is said to have *property (RD) with respect to ℓ* if there exists a polynomial P such that for any $r \in \mathbf{R}_+$ and $f \in \mathbf{C}\Gamma$ supported on elements of length shorter than r the following inequality holds:

$$\|f\|_* \leq P(r)\|f\|_2$$

where $\|f\|_*$ denotes the operator norm of f acting by left convolution on $\ell^2(\Gamma)$, and $\|f\|_2$ the usual ℓ^2 norm. Property (RD) has been first established for free groups by Haagerup in [4], but introduced and studied by P. Jolissaint in [7], who established it for classical hyperbolic groups. The extension to Gromov hyperbolic groups is due to P. de la Harpe in [5]. Providing the first examples of higher rank groups, J. Ramagge, G. Robertson and T. Steger in [10] proved that property (RD) holds for discrete groups acting freely on the vertices of an $\tilde{A}_1 \times \tilde{A}_1$ or $\tilde{A}_2$ building and recently V. Lafforgue did it for cocompact lattices in $SL_3(\mathbf{R})$ and $SL_3(\mathbf{C})$ in [8]. A conjecture, due to A. Valette, see [1] claims that property (RD) holds for any discrete group acting isometrically, properly and cocompactly either on a Riemannian symmetric space or on an affine building. Property (RD) is important in the context of Baum-Connes conjecture, precisely, V. Lafforgue in [9] proved that for “good” groups having property (RD), the Baum-Connes conjecture without coefficients holds.

In this article we establish property (RD) for discrete cocompact subgroups Γ of a finite product of type

$$\text{Iso}(\mathcal{X}_1) \times \cdots \times \text{Iso}(\mathcal{X}_n)$$

where the $\mathcal{X}_i$'s are either Gromov hyperbolic spaces, buildings associated to $SL_3(F)$ (for F a non-archimedean locally compact field), or symmetric spaces associated to Lie groups whose restricted root system is of type A_2 (those are known to be locally isomorphic to $SL_3(\mathbf{R})$, $SL_3(\mathbf{C})$, $SL_3(\mathbf{H})$ and $E_{6(-26)}$, see [6]). In particular, this immediately implies the following

Theorem 0.1. *Any cocompact lattice in*

$$G = G_1 \times \cdots \times G_n$$

has property (RD), where the G_i 's are either rank one Lie groups, $SL_3(\mathbf{R})$, $SL_3(\mathbf{C})$, $SL_3(\mathbf{H})$ or $E_{6(-26)}$.

To establish this result, we will first answer (positively) a question posed by V. Lafforgue in [8], which was to know whether his Lemmas 3.5 and 3.7 are still true for

Date: April 2001.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* [

the groups $SL_3(\mathbf{H})$ and $E_{6(-26)}$, whose associated symmetric spaces have also flats of type A_2 . Observing that these lemmas are in fact “three points conditions” it will be enough to prove that if X denotes $SL_3(\mathbf{H})/SU_3(\mathbf{H})$ or $E_{6(-26)}/F_{4(-52)}$ then for any three points in X there exists a totally geodesic embedding of $SL_3(\mathbf{C})/SU_3(\mathbf{C})$ containing those three points. Secondly we will explain how to use the techniques used in [10] and [8] for the above described products. This provides many new examples of groups with property (RD), such as irreducible cocompact lattices in $SL_2(\mathbf{R}) \times SL_2(\mathbf{R})$.

Finally we remark that combining our result with V. Lafforgue’s crucial theorem in [9] yields the following

Corollary 0.2. *The Baum-Connes conjecture without coefficients (see [13]) holds for any cocompact lattice in*

$$G = G_1 \times \cdots \times G_n$$

where the G_i ’s are either rank one Lie groups, $SL_3(\mathbf{R})$, $SL_3(\mathbf{C})$, $SL_3(\mathbf{H})$ or $E_{6(-26)}$.

It is a pleasure to thank my thesis advisor A. Valette for suggesting me this problem and for all his generous help. I must also thank V. Lafforgue for graciously explaining the methods of [10] and [8] to me. I am also extremely indebted to D. Allcock and G. Prasad for important discussions on the exceptional group $E_{6(-26)}$.

1. THE CASE OF $SL_3(\mathbf{H})$.

We will write $\mathbf{H}$ for *Hamilton’s Quaternion algebra*, which is a 4 dimensional vector space over $\mathbf{R}$, whose basis is given by the elements $1, i, j$ and k , satisfying

$$i^2 = j^2 = k^2 = -1, \quad ij = k, \quad ki = j, \quad jk = i.$$

This is an associative division algebra endowed with an involution $h \mapsto \bar{h}$ which is the identity over 1 , and minus the identity over i, j and k . A norm on $\mathbf{H}$ can be given by $|h| = \sqrt{h\bar{h}} \in \mathbf{R}_+$. A quaternion will be called a *unit* if of norm one, *real* if lying in $\text{span}\{1\}$ and *imaginary* if lying in $\text{span}\{1\}^\perp$ (for the scalar product of $\mathbf{R}^4$ which turns the above described basis in an orthonormal basis). Note that an imaginary unit has square -1 . The following lemma is obvious:

Lemma 1.1. *Any element $h \in \mathbf{H}$ is contained in a commutative subfield of $\mathbf{H}$.*

□

Definition 1.2. Denote by I the identity matrix in $M_3(\mathbf{C})$, and

$$J = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -I \\ I & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in M_6(\mathbf{C}),$$

we write

$$M_3(\mathbf{H}) = \{M \in M_6(\mathbf{C}) \text{ such that } JMJ^{-1} = \overline{M}\}$$

$$SL_3(\mathbf{H}) = \{M \in M_3(\mathbf{H}) \text{ such that } \det(M) = 1\}$$

$$SU_3(\mathbf{H}) = \{M \in SL_3(\mathbf{H}) \text{ such that } MM^* = M^*M = I\}.$$

Remark 1.3. 1) Given any imaginary unit $\mu \in \mathbf{H}$, we can write $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{C} \oplus \mathbf{C}\mu$, and thus decompose any $h \in \mathbf{H}$ as $h = h_1 + h_2\mu$, with $h_1, h_2 \in \mathbf{C}$. Similarly, any 3×3 matrix M with coefficients in $\mathbf{H}$ can be written $M = M_1 + M_2\mu$, with $M_1, M_2 \in M_3(\mathbf{C})$. The $*$ -homomorphism

$$M \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} M_1 & -\overline{M_2} \\ M_2 & \overline{M_1} \end{pmatrix}$$

gives then an isomorphism between the algebra of 3×3 matrices with coefficients in $\mathbf{H}$ (and usual multiplication) and $M_3(\mathbf{H})$ as just defined. It is a straightforward computation to see that elements of type

$$\mathcal{T}_\lambda = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

with λ a unit in $\mathbf{H}$ actually belong to $SU_3(\mathbf{H})$.

Definition 1.4. Let $\mathbf{K}$ denote $\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{C}$ or $\mathbf{H}$. We set

$$X_{\mathbf{K}} = SL_3(\mathbf{K})/SU_3(\mathbf{K}).$$

It will be convenient for us to choose

$$\{M \in SL_3(\mathbf{K}) \text{ such that } M^* = M, M \text{ positive}\}$$

as a model for $X_{\mathbf{K}}$. On $X_{\mathbf{K}}$ we consider the action of $SL_3(\mathbf{K})$ given by:

$$\begin{aligned} SL_3(\mathbf{K}) \times X_{\mathbf{K}} &\rightarrow X_{\mathbf{K}} \\ (g, z) &\mapsto g(z) = (gz^2g^*)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

This action is transitive since for $M \in X_{\mathbf{K}}$, setting $g = M$ we get that $g(I) = M$. Moreover the stabilizer of I is clearly $SU_3(\mathbf{K})$. We equip $X_{\mathbf{K}}$ with the distance

$$d_{\mathbf{K}}(x, y) = \log \|x^{-1}y\| + \log \|y^{-1}x\|.$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the operator norm on $SL_3(\mathbf{K})$ acting on $\mathbf{K}^3$. Notice that for $a \in X_{\mathbf{K}}$ a diagonal matrix (thus real), if we assume that

$$a = \begin{pmatrix} e^{\alpha_1} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{\alpha_2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & e^{\alpha_3} \end{pmatrix} \text{ with } \alpha_1 \geq \alpha_2 \geq \alpha_3 \text{ and } \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 = 0$$

we get that $d_{\mathbf{K}}(a, I) = \alpha_1 - \alpha_3$. Denote by A the set of all diagonal matrices in $X_{\mathbf{K}}$. To stick with the classical terminology, we will call *flats* the sets of type $g(A)$ for a $g \in SL_3(\mathbf{K})$.

Remark 1.5. The action of $SL_3(\mathbf{K})$ on $X_{\mathbf{K}}$ is by isometries with respect to the above given distance (in other words, the distance is $SL_3(\mathbf{K})$ -invariant): For $x, y \in X_{\mathbf{K}}$, we have to show that the operator norm of $x^{-1}y$ is equal to that of $z = g(y)^{-1}g(x) = (gx^2g^*)^{-1/2}(gy^2g^*)^{1/2}$. But for any $k_1, k_2 \in SU_3(\mathbf{K})$, $\|z\| = \|k_1zk_2\|$, so setting $k_1 = (gx)^{-1}(gx^2g^*)^{1/2}$ and $k_2 = (gy^2g^*)^{-1/2}gy$, we get that $k_1zk_2 = x^{-1}y$. Notice that for $g \in SL_3(\mathbf{K})$, the standard action $z \mapsto gzg^*$ is not isometric. Indeed, the operator norm is in general not invariant by conjugation by g unless $g = k \in SU_3(\mathbf{K})$, and in that case $k(z) = (kz^2k^*)^{1/2} = (kzk^*kzk^*)^{1/2} = kzk^*$.

Lemma 1.6. Let $\varphi : \mathbf{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{H}$ be an isometric injective ring homomorphism. It induces a group homomorphism

$$\varphi^* : SL_3(\mathbf{C}) \rightarrow SL_3(\mathbf{H})$$

which induces a totally geodesic isometric embedding

$$\overline{\varphi} : X_{\mathbf{C}} \rightarrow X_{\mathbf{H}}.$$

Proof. That φ^* is a homomorphism is clear in view of Remark 1.3, so let us now show that $\overline{\varphi}$ is an isometry. Since $SL_3(\mathbf{C})$ acts transitively and by isometries on $X_{\mathbf{C}}$, it will be enough to show that

$$d_{\mathbf{H}}(\overline{\varphi}(x), I) = d_{\mathbf{C}}(x, I)$$

for any $x \in X_{\mathbf{C}}$. Noticing that $\varphi^*(SU_3(\mathbf{C})) \subset SU_3(\mathbf{H})$ we deduce that for any $g \in SL_3(\mathbf{C})$, $\overline{\varphi}(g(x)) = \varphi^*(g)(\overline{\varphi}(x))$. Now, for $x \in X_{\mathbf{C}}$, there exists $k \in SU_3(\mathbf{C})$ such that $k(x) = a$ is diagonal with positive coefficients. Since φ is a ring homomorphism, it is the identity over the real numbers and so:

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\mathbf{C}}(x, I) &= d_{\mathbf{C}}(k(x), k(I)) = d_{\mathbf{C}}(a, I) = d_{\mathbf{H}}(a, I) \\ &= d_{\mathbf{H}}(\varphi^*(k^*)(a), \varphi^*(k^*)(I)) = d_{\mathbf{H}}(\overline{\varphi}(k^*(a)), I) \\ &= d_{\mathbf{H}}(\overline{\varphi}(x), I). \end{aligned}$$

Let us now prove that the embedding is totally geodesic. Take x, y in the image of $\overline{\varphi}$, so that $x = \overline{\varphi}(x')$ and $y = \overline{\varphi}(y')$ for $x', y' \in X_{\mathbf{C}}$. There is a $g \in SL_3(\mathbf{C})$ so that $x' = g(I)$ and $y' = g(a)$ for $a \in A$. Then $x = \overline{\varphi}(g(I)) = \varphi^*(g)(I)$ and $y = \overline{\varphi}(g(a)) = \varphi^*(g)(a)$. Since A is obviously in the image of $\overline{\varphi}$, so will $\varphi^*(g)(A)$ be (that is, the whole flat containing x and y is in the image of the embedding). Since a geodesic γ between x and y lies in any flat containing them, we conclude that $\gamma \subset \varphi^*(g)(A) \subset \overline{\varphi}(X_{\mathbf{C}})$. $\square$

Remark 1.7. Any element of $X_{\mathbf{H}}$ can be diagonalized using elements of type $\mathcal{T}_h$ (described in Remark 1.3) and of $SO_3(\mathbf{R})$. Indeed, take $z = (z_{ij}) \in X_{\mathbf{H}}$, then $z' = \mathcal{T}_h(z)$ with $h = \overline{z_{12}}/|z_{12}|$ verifies that $z'_{ij} \in \mathbf{R}$ for $i, j = 1, 2$ (in case $z_{12} = 0$, or if it lies in $\mathbf{R}$ we can just skip this step). Take $k \in SO_2(\mathbf{R})$ diagonalizing the 2×2 matrix (z'_{ij}) $i, j = 1, 2$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} z'' &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} k & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} z' \begin{pmatrix} k^* & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} z''_{11} & z''_{12} & z''_{13} \\ \overline{z''_{12}} & z''_{22} & 0 \\ z''_{13} & 0 & z''_{33} \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

with $z''_{11}, z''_{22}, z''_{33} \in \mathbf{R}$. Repeating this argument twice we get the diagonalization.

The above given argument shows that the subgroup of $SL_3(\mathbf{H})$ generated by the $\mathcal{T}_h$'s and $SL_3(\mathbf{R})$ acts transitively on $X_{\mathbf{H}}$. Since the $\mathcal{T}_h$'s and $SO_3(\mathbf{R})$ do stabilize I , we can conclude that $SL_3(\mathbf{H})$ is generated by elements of type $\mathcal{T}_h$ and $SL_3(\mathbf{R})$.

Proposition 1.8. *For any three points in $X_{\mathbf{H}}$ there is a totally geodesic embedding of $X_{\mathbf{C}}$ containing those three points.*

Proof. Let $x, y, z \in X_{\mathbf{H}}$. Up to multiplication by an element of $SL_3(\mathbf{H})$ (which is an isometry), we can assume that $x = I$ and y is a diagonal matrix (see the previous Remark). We write

$$z = \begin{pmatrix} z_{11} & z_{12} & z_{13} \\ \overline{z_{12}} & z_{22} & z_{23} \\ \overline{z_{13}} & \overline{z_{23}} & z_{33} \end{pmatrix}$$

with $z_{11}, z_{22}, z_{33} \in \mathbf{R}$ and z_{12}, z_{13} and z_{23} in $\mathbf{H}$. Consider the element

$$k = \begin{pmatrix} \overline{z_{12}}/|z_{12}| & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \overline{z_{23}}/|z_{23}| \end{pmatrix} \in SU_3(\mathbf{H}),$$

then $k(z)$ only has real elements except for $k(z)_{13} = \overline{k(z)_{31}}$, and $k(a) = a$ for any diagonal element a . Applying Lemma 1.1 to $k(z)_{13}$, we get an embedding of $\mathbf{C}$ in $\mathbf{H}$ which contains $k(z)_{13}$, and thus a totally geodesical embedding $\overline{\varphi} : X_{\mathbf{C}} \rightarrow X_{\mathbf{H}}$ whose image contains x, y and z . $\square$

2. THE CASE OF $E_{6(-26)}$.

We will write $\mathbf{O}$ for the 8 dimensional algebra over $\mathbf{R}$, whose basis is given by the elements $e_0, e_1, \dots, e_7$, satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} e_i e_0 &= e_0 e_i = e_i, e_i^2 = -e_0 && \text{for all } i = 1, \dots, 7 \\ e_i e_j &= -e_j e_i && \text{if } i \neq j \text{ and } i, j \neq 0 \\ e_2 e_6 &= e_3 e_4 = e_5 e_7 = e_1 \end{aligned}$$

and all those one can deduce by cyclically permuting the indices from 1 to 7. This is a non-associative division algebra, endowed with an involution $x \mapsto \bar{x}$ which is the identity over e_0 , and minus the identity over e_i , for all $i = 1, \dots, 7$. A norm on $\mathbf{O}$ can be given by $|x| = \sqrt{x\bar{x}} \in \mathbf{R}_+$. The division algebra $\mathbf{O}$ is called the *Cayley Octonions*. An octonion will be called a *unit* if of norm one, *real* if lying in $\text{span}\{e_0\}$ and *imaginary* if lying in $\text{span}\{e_0\}^\perp$ (for the scalar product of $\mathbf{R}^8$ which turns the above described basis in an orthonormal basis). The following

Theorem 2.1 (Artin, see [11] page 29). *Any two elements of $\mathbf{O}$ are contained in an associative sub-division algebra of $\mathbf{O}$.*

will allow us to apply the arguments used in the previous section to $E_{6(-26)}$.

We will now give a definition of $E_{6(-26)}$, of a maximal compact subgroup $F_{4(-52)}$, and of a model for $X_{\mathbf{O}} = E_{6(-26)}/F_{4(-52)}$. This part is based on the work of H. Freudenthal, see [2] and [3].

Definition 2.2. Denote by $M_3(\mathbf{O})$ the set of 3×3 matrices with coefficients on $\mathbf{O}$. For $M = (m_{ij}) \in M_3(\mathbf{O})$ write $M^* = \overline{M}^t = (\overline{m}_{ji})$. The *exceptional Jordan algebra* is given by

$$\mathcal{J} = \{M \in M_3(\mathbf{O}) \text{ such that } M = M^*\}$$

which is stable under the *Jordan multiplication* given by

$$M \star N = \frac{1}{2}(MN + NM).$$

H. Freudenthal defined an application

$$\begin{aligned} \det : \mathcal{J} &\rightarrow \mathbf{R} \\ \begin{pmatrix} \xi_1 & x_3 & \bar{x}_2 \\ \bar{x}_3 & \xi_2 & x_1 \\ x_2 & \bar{x}_1 & \xi_3 \end{pmatrix} &\mapsto \xi_1 \xi_2 \xi_3 - \left(\sum_{i=1}^3 \xi_i |x_i|^2 \right) + 2\Re(x_1 x_2 x_3) \end{aligned}$$

(where $\Re$ denotes the real part, and is well defined even without parenthesis), showed that

$$E_{6(-26)} = \{g \in GL(\mathcal{J}) \text{ such that } \det \circ g = \det\},$$

and that

$$F_{4(-52)} = \{g \in E_{6(-26)} \text{ such that } g(I) = I\}$$

is the automorphism group of $\mathcal{J}$ and is a maximal compact subgroup in $E_{6(-26)}$.

Remarks 2.3. We will now explicitly show some elements of $E_{6(-26)}$ (see [3] for the proofs of their belonging to $E_{6(-26)}$):

1) Any element x of $SL_3(\mathbf{R})$ gives a map $x : \mathcal{J} \rightarrow \mathcal{J}$ by $M \mapsto x(M) = xMx^t$ which preserves the determinant.

2) Let a be a unit in $\mathbf{O}$, define

$$\varphi_a = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & a & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \bar{a} \end{pmatrix}.$$

The map $\psi_a : \mathcal{J} \rightarrow \mathcal{J}$, defined as $\psi_a(M) = \varphi_{\bar{a}} M \varphi_a$ (and no parenthesis are needed) is in $E_{6(-26)}$, and even in $F_{4(-52)}$.

3) H. Freudenthal proves (see [2], page 40) that elements in $\mathcal{J}$ are diagonalizable by elements in $F_{4(-52)}$, that the elements on the diagonal are uniquely determined up to permutation.

Definition 2.4. We say that an element $M \in \mathcal{J}$ is *positive* if after diagonalization it only has positive elements. We define

$$X_{\mathbf{O}} = \{M \in \mathcal{J} \text{ such that } \det(M) = 1 \text{ and positive}\}.$$

We let $E_{6(-26)}$ act on $X_{\mathbf{O}}$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} E_{6(-26)} \times X_{\mathbf{O}} &\rightarrow X_{\mathbf{O}} \\ (g, M) &\mapsto g \circ M = \sqrt{g(M^2)} \end{aligned}$$

where (for M positive) $\sqrt{M}$ is an element Y in $X_{\mathbf{O}}$ satisfying $Y \star Y = M$, and well defined by requiring positivity. Notice that for $k \in F_{4(-52)}$, we have that $k \circ M = k(M)$.

Proposition 2.5. *The group $E_{6(-26)}$ acts transitively on $X_{\mathbf{O}}$, and the stabilizer of I is $F_{4(-52)}$.*

Proof. Since $k \circ I = k(I) = I$, the stabilizer of I is $F_{4(-52)}$, and the action is transitive because given any $M \in X_{\mathbf{O}}$, there exists a $k \in F_{4(-52)}$ such that $k \circ M = D$ is diagonal. Since $\det(M) = \det(k(M)) = 1$, the element D^{-1} defines an element in $E_{6(-26)}$ (coming from $SL_3(\mathbf{R})$), and $D^{-1} \circ D = I$. $\square$

Remark 2.6. For any two elements M, N of $X_{\mathbf{O}}$, there exists a $g \in E_{6(-26)}$ such that $M = g \circ I$ and $N = g \circ D$ where D is a diagonal matrix in $X_{\mathbf{O}}$. Indeed, in the proof of the preceding proposition we saw that there exists an $h \in E_{6(-26)}$ with $I = h \circ M$, and that any matrix (and thus in particular $h \circ N$) is diagonalizable with elements of $F_{4(-52)}$. We then choose $k \in F_{4(-52)}$ such that $k(h \circ N) = D$ is diagonal, and set $g = (kh)^{-1}$.

Definition 2.7. For a diagonal element D in $X_{\mathbf{O}}$, we set

$$\|D\| = \max\{d_i | i = 1, 2, 3\}$$

where the d_i 's denote the elements in the diagonal of D . We equip $X_{\mathbf{O}}$ with the distance

$$d(M, N) = \log \|D\| + \log \|D^{-1}\|.$$

for D as in the previous remark. It is well defined because of point 3) of Remark 2.3.

Any embedding of $\mathbf{H}$ in $\mathbf{O}$ gives a decomposition $\mathbf{O} = \mathbf{H} \oplus \mathbf{H}\ell$ (where ℓ is any unit in the orthogonal complement of the embedded copy of $\mathbf{H}$ in $\mathbf{O}$), and we will now describe some other elements in $F_{4(-52)}$ that will later be useful to embed $SL_3(\mathbf{H})$ in $E_{6(-26)}$ starting from an embedding of $\mathbf{H}$ in $\mathbf{O}$. Given a unit $h \in \mathbf{H}$ we define two maps

$$\begin{aligned} t_h, u_h : \mathbf{O} &\rightarrow \mathbf{O} \\ x = a + b\ell &\mapsto t_h(x) = ha + b\ell \\ &u_h(x) = a + (b\bar{h})\ell \end{aligned}$$

and an element (that we will later prove to belong to $F_{4(-52)}$)

$$T_h : \mathcal{J} \rightarrow \mathcal{J}$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} \xi_1 & x_3 & \bar{x}_2 \\ \bar{x}_3 & \xi_2 & x_1 \\ x_2 & \bar{x}_1 & \xi_3 \end{pmatrix} \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} \xi_1 & t_h(x_3) & t_h(\bar{x}_2) \\ \frac{t_h(x_3)}{t_h(\bar{x}_2)} & \xi_2 & \frac{t_h(\bar{x}_2)}{u_h(\bar{x}_1)} \\ \frac{t_h(x_3)}{t_h(\bar{x}_2)} & u_h(\bar{x}_1) & \xi_3 \end{pmatrix}$$

Using that for $x = a + b\ell$ and $y = c + d\ell$, the product xy reads $(ac - \bar{d}b) + (b\bar{c} + da)\ell$ (see [12]), it is a direct computation to check that $\det \circ T_h = \det$.

Knowing that $T_h \in E_{6(-26)}$, it is pretty clear that $T_h(I) = I$, and thus $T_h \in F_{4(-52)}$. We will now, for any given embedding of $\mathbf{H}$ in $\mathbf{O}$, define an explicit embedding of $SL_3(\mathbf{H})$ in $E_{6(-26)}$.

Lemma 2.8. *Let S denote the subgroup of $E_{6(-26)}$ generated by elements of the type $x \in SL_3(\mathbf{R})$ and T_h for h a unit in $\mathbf{H}$ as just described. Then S is isomorphic to $SL_3(\mathbf{H})$.*

Proof. An embedding of $\mathbf{H}$ in $\mathbf{O}$ defines an embedding of $X_{\mathbf{H}}$ in $\mathcal{J}$ by taking the images in $\mathbf{O}$ of the coefficients of an element in $X_{\mathbf{H}}$. It will now be enough to see that the map

$$\begin{aligned} \rho : S &\rightarrow SL_3(\mathbf{H}) \\ z &\mapsto z|_{X_{\mathbf{H}}} \end{aligned}$$

is well defined and a group isomorphism.

Remember that for h a unit in $\mathbf{H}$ we denoted by $T_h \in SL_3(\mathbf{H})$ a diagonal matrix with h in the first place and 1's in the second and third place. Now, notice (from the definition of T_h) that $\rho(T_h) = T_h$ for any h a unit in $\mathbf{H}$ and that trivially, for $x \in SL_3(\mathbf{R})$, $\rho(x) \in SL_3(\mathbf{H})$. This shows that the image of ρ is contained in $SL_3(\mathbf{H})$. The map ρ being a restriction, it is a group homomorphism.

Our map ρ is clearly injective, and because of Remark 1.5 we know that ρ maps the generators of S onto those of $SL_3(\mathbf{H})$. $\square$

Proposition 2.9. *For any three points in $X_{\mathbf{O}}$ there is a totally geodesic embedding of $X_{\mathbf{C}}$ containing those three points.*

Proof. Let $x, y, z \in X_{\mathbf{O}}$. Up to multiplication by an element of $E_{6(-26)}$ (which is an isometry), we can assume that $x = I$ and y is a diagonal matrix (use Remark 2.6). We write

$$z = \begin{pmatrix} z_{11} & z_{12} & z_{13} \\ \bar{z}_{12} & z_{22} & z_{23} \\ \bar{z}_{13} & \bar{z}_{23} & z_{33} \end{pmatrix}$$

with $z_{11}, z_{22}, z_{33} \in \mathbf{R}$ and z_{12}, z_{13} and z_{23} in $\mathbf{O}$. Consider the element $k = \phi_a$ where $a = \bar{z}_{12}/|z_{12}|$ is a unit in $\mathbf{O}$ then $k(z)$ only has real elements except for $k(z)_{13} = \bar{k}(z)_{31}$, and $k(d) = d$ for any diagonal element in $X_{\mathbf{O}}$. Applying Theorem 2.1 to $k(z)_{13}$ and $k(z)_{23}$, we get an embedding of $\mathbf{H}$ in $\mathbf{O}$ which contains $k(z)_{13}$ and $k(z)_{23}$, and thus an embedding $\bar{\varphi} : X_{\mathbf{H}} \rightarrow X_{\mathbf{O}}$ whose image contains x, y and z , and which is isometric by definition of the distance on $X_{\mathbf{O}}$.

To see that the embedding is totally geodesic is basically the same argument as in the proof of Proposition 1.6: Take x, y in the image of $\bar{\varphi}$, so that $x = \bar{\varphi}(x')$ and $y = \bar{\varphi}(y')$ for $x', y' \in X_{\mathbf{C}}$. There is a $g \in SL_3(\mathbf{C})$ so that $x' = g(I)$ and $y' = g(a)$ for $a \in A$. Now, the embedding $\bar{\varphi}$ comes from an embedding $\varphi^* : SL_3(\mathbf{H}) \rightarrow E_{6(-26)}$ described in Lemma 2.8, so that $x = \bar{\varphi}(g(I)) = \varphi^*(g)(I)$ and $y = \bar{\varphi}(g(a)) = \varphi^*(g)(a)$. Since A is obviously in the image of $\bar{\varphi}$, so will $\varphi^*(g)(A)$ be (that is, the whole flat containing x and y is in the image of the embedding).

Since a geodesic γ between x and y lies in any flat containing them, we conclude that $\gamma \subset \varphi^*(g)(A) \subset \overline{\varphi}(X_{\mathbf{C}})$.

We are now reduced to find an embedding of $X_{\mathbf{C}}$ in $X_{\mathbf{H}}$ containing x, y and z , but we get this one because of Proposition 1.8, and combining it with $\overline{\varphi}$ we get the sought embedding. $\square$

3. HOW WE ANSWER V. LAFFORGUE'S QUESTION.

We will now see how Proposition 1.8 and 2.9 imply that Lemmas 3.5 and 3.7 of V. Lafforgue's paper [8] hold. To see how property (RD) can be deduced we refer to the next section. But before proceeding, here are some definitions and notations.

Definition 3.1. Let G denote $SL_3(\mathbf{K})$ (for $\mathbf{K} = \mathbf{R}, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{H}$) or $E_{6(-26)}$ and K denote $SU_3(\mathbf{K})$ or $F_{4(-52)}$, and $X_{\mathbf{K}} = G/K$. Denote by A the diagonal matrices in $X_{\mathbf{K}}$. The Cartan decomposition states then that $G = K(A)$. Moreover, for any $x, y \in X_{\mathbf{K}}$, there exists $g \in G$ so that $x, y \in g(A)$. For any $t \in \mathbf{R}$, $x, y, z \in X_{\mathbf{K}}$, we say that (x, y) is of shape $(t, 0)$ if there exists $g \in G$ such that

$$g(x) = I, \quad g(y) = e^{-t/3} \begin{pmatrix} e^t & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

and that (x, y, z) is an *equilateral triangle* of oriented size t (where $t \in \mathbf{R}$ can be positive or negative) if there exists $g \in G$ such that

$$g(x) = I, \quad g(y) = e^{-t/3} \begin{pmatrix} e^t & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad g(z) = e^{-2t/3} \begin{pmatrix} e^t & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & e^t & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Let (X, d) be a metric space and $\delta \geq 0$. For any finite sequence of points $x_1 \dots, x_n \in X$ we say that $x_1 \dots x_n$ is a δ -path if

$$d(x_1, x_2) + \dots + d(x_{n-1}, x_n) \leq d(x_1, x_n) + \delta$$

and that three points $x, y, z \in X$ form δ -retractable triple if there exists $t \in \mathbf{R}$ such that the paths xy, yz and zx are δ -paths.

Lemma 3.2. Let $\mathbf{K} = \mathbf{H}$ or $\mathbf{O}$. For any $\delta_0 > 0$ there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that the following is true:

1) For any $x, y, z \in X_{\mathbf{K}}$ there exists x', y', z' an equilateral triangle in $X_{\mathbf{K}}$ such that the paths $xx'y'y, yy'z'z, zz'x'x$ are δ -paths.

2) For any $s, t \in \mathbf{R}$ of same sign and $x, v, w, y \in X_{\mathbf{K}}$ such that $d(v, w) < \delta_0$, (v, z) is of shape $(t, 0)$ and (w, y) is of shape $(s, 0)$, the triangle z, v, y is δ -retractable.

Proof. 1) Because of Proposition 1.8 and 2.9, there is an isometric copy of $X_{\mathbf{C}}$ in $X_{\mathbf{K}}$ containing x, y, z . Thus, because of Lemma 3.6 in [8] there exists $\delta \geq 0$ and x', y', z' an equilateral triangle in $X_{\mathbf{C}}$ such that the paths $xx'y'y, yy'z'z$ and $zz'x'x$ are δ -paths. Since the embedding is totally geodesic, the triangle x', y', z' will be equilateral in $X_{\mathbf{K}}$ as well.

2) Without loss of generality, we can assume that $w = I$ and that y is diagonal, so that $z, v \in h(A)$ for an $h \in G$ such that $d(h(I), I) \leq \delta_0$. Because of Proposition 1.8 and 2.9 there is a totally geodesic embedding $\overline{\varphi}: X_{\mathbf{C}} \rightarrow X_{\mathbf{K}}$ containing $h(I), w$ and y . But since $\overline{\varphi}$ comes from an embedding $\varphi: SL_3(\mathbf{C}) \rightarrow G$ we have that:

$$h(I) = \overline{\varphi}(\overline{h}) = \overline{\varphi}(h'(I)) = \varphi(h')(I)$$

(for an $\overline{h} \in X_{\mathbf{C}}$ and $h' \in SL_3(\mathbf{C})$) so that the whole $h(A)$ is contained in the image of $\overline{\varphi}$ in $X_{\mathbf{K}}$ and we thus can see x, v, w and y in $X_{\mathbf{C}}$. Using Lemma 3.7 in [8], the triangle z, v, y is δ -retractable in $X_{\mathbf{C}}$, and since the embedding is totally geodesic, it will be δ -retractable in $X_{\mathbf{K}}$ as well. $\square$

4. HOW TO ESTABLISH PROPERTY (RD)

We start by recalling some definitions that can be found in [8].

Definition 4.1. Let $\delta \geq 0$. A discrete metric space (X, d) satisfies *property* (H_δ) if for there exists a polynomial P_δ such that for any $r \in \mathbf{R}_+$, $x, y \in X$ one has

$$\sharp\{t \in X \text{ such that } d(x, t) \leq r, \text{ and } xty \text{ is a } \delta\text{-path}\} \leq P_\delta(r).$$

We say that (X, d) satisfies *property* (H) if it satisfies (H_δ) for any $\delta \geq 0$. For any $r \in \mathbf{R}_+$, and $x \in X$ let $B(x, r) \subset X$ denote the open ball of radius r centered in x . A subset $Y \subset X$ is a *uniform net* in X if there exists two constants r_Y and R_Y in $\mathbf{R}_+$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} B(y, r_Y) \cap Y &= \{y\} & \text{for any } y \in Y \\ B(x, R_Y) \cap Y &\neq \emptyset & \text{for any } x \in X \end{aligned}$$

Remark 4.2. In other words, property (H) gives a polynomial bound for geodesics between two points. V. Lafforgue, in [8] proved that any uniform net in a semi-simple Lie group has property (H) , provided that the distance takes into account every root.

Definition 4.3. Let (X, d) be a metric space and Γ be a discrete group acting by isometries on X . The pair (X, Γ) satisfy *property* (K) if there exists $\delta \geq 0$, $k \in \mathbf{N}$ and Γ -invariant subsets $\mathcal{T}_1, \dots, \mathcal{T}_k$ of X^3 such that:

(K_a) There exists $C \in \mathbf{R}_+$ such that for any $(x, y, z) \in X^3$, there exists $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ and $(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) \in \mathcal{T}_i$ such that

$$\max\{d(\alpha, \beta), d(\beta, \gamma), d(\gamma, \alpha)\} \leq C \min\{d(x, y), d(y, z), d(z, x)\} + \delta$$

and $x\alpha\beta y, y\beta\gamma z, z\gamma\alpha x$ are δ -paths.

(K_b) For any $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ and $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \gamma' \in X$, if $(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) \in \mathcal{T}_i$ and $(\alpha, \beta, \gamma') \in \mathcal{T}_i$ then the triangles $\alpha\gamma\gamma'$ and $\beta\gamma\gamma'$ are δ -retractable.

Theorem 4.4 (V. Lafforgue [8]). *Let X be a discrete metric space, and let Γ be a group acting freely and isometrically on X . If the pair (X, Γ) satisfies (H) and (K) , then Γ satisfies property (RD) .*

From now on, $\mathcal{K}$ will denote a finite product of metric spaces as described in the introduction. The two following lemmas will show why any uniform net in $\mathcal{K}$ has property (H) .

Lemma 4.5. *Let X be a uniform net in a geodesic metric space $(\mathcal{H}, d)$. If X satisfies property (H) , then so will any other uniform net Y in $\mathcal{H}$.*

Proof. Take $x, y \in \mathcal{H}$ and set, for any $\delta \geq 0$,

$$\Upsilon_{(\delta, r)}(x, y) = \{t \in \mathcal{H} \mid xty \text{ is a } \delta\text{-path, } d(x, t) \leq r\}.$$

Because of property (H) we can cover $\Upsilon_{(\delta, r)}(x, y)$ with $P_\epsilon(r)$ balls of radius R_X centered at each point of $\Upsilon_{(\delta, r)}(x, y) \cap X$, where P_ϵ denotes the polynomial associated to the constant $\epsilon = 2R_X + \delta$ in the definition of property (H) . Now, take $z \in Y$ so that xzy is a δ -path. Since in particular $z \in \mathcal{H}$, we can find $t \in X$ at a distance less than R_X , and thus z is in the ball of radius R_X centered at t . It is now obvious that xty is a $2R_X + \delta$ -path. But in each ball of radius R_X there is a uniformly bounded number N of elements of Y , so that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sharp\{t \in Y \text{ such that } d(x, t) \leq r, \text{ and } xty \text{ is a } \delta\text{-path}\} \\ & \leq N \sharp\{t \in X \text{ such that } d(x, t) \leq r, \text{ and } xty \text{ is a } (2R_X + \delta)\text{-path}\} \\ & \leq NP_\epsilon(r) \end{aligned}$$

and thus Y satisfies property (H) , choosing $P_\delta = NP_\epsilon$. $\square$

Lemma 4.6. *Let $(\mathcal{H}_1, d_1) \dots (\mathcal{H}_n, d_n)$ be metric spaces whose uniform nets all have property (H) . Endow $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{H}_n$ with the ℓ^1 combination of the distances d_i , then any uniform net in $\mathcal{H}$ has property (H) .*

Proof. Because of Lemma 4.5, it is enough to show that one particular uniform net has property (H) . To do that, let $X_1 \subset \mathcal{H}_1 \dots X_n \subset \mathcal{H}_n$ be uniform nets and look at $X = X_1 \times \dots \times X_n$, which is a uniform net in $\mathcal{H}$. Take $x, y \in X$, $\delta, r \geq 0$ and $t \in \Upsilon_{(\delta, r)}(x, y)$. We write x, y, t in coordinates, that is to say $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$, $y = (y_1, \dots, y_n)$ and $t = (t_1, \dots, t_n)$, where $x_i, y_i, t_i \in X_i$ for any $i = 1, \dots, n$. On each factor X_i , $x_i t_i y_i$ will be a δ -path as well, and since we are considering the ℓ^1 combination of norms, $d_i(x_i, t_i) \leq r$. On each X_i there is by assumption at most $P_{\delta, i}(r)$ of those points t_i and thus on X we have at most

$$P_\delta(r) = \prod_{i=1}^n P_{\delta, i}(r)$$

t 's at distance to x less than r and such that xyt is a δ -path. Obviously P_δ is again a polynomial (of degree the sum of the degrees of the $P_{\delta, i}$'s) and thus X has property (H) . $\square$

It is an easy observation that any uniform net in a Gromov hyperbolic space has property (H) , and thus, since any of the metric spaces forming $\mathcal{K}$ have property (H) , we deduce that $\mathcal{K}$ has property (H) as well. Let us now see what happens to property (K) .

Definition 4.7. A triple $x, y, z \in \mathcal{K}$ forms an *equilateral triangle* if when we write in coordinates $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$, $y = (y_1, \dots, y_n)$ and $z = (z_1, \dots, z_n)$, the triples $x_i, y_i, z_i \in \mathcal{X}_i$ form

- an equilateral triangle in the sense given in Definition 3.1 if $\mathcal{X}_i$ is an X_K .
- an equilateral triangle in the sense given in [10] if $\mathcal{X}_i$ is an $\tilde{A}_2$ -type building.
- a single point (i.e. $x_i = y_i = z_i$) if $\mathcal{X}_i$ is a hyperbolic space.

Since we endowed $\mathcal{K}$ with the ℓ^1 combinations of the norms on the $\mathcal{X}_i$'s it is obvious that in particular an equilateral triangle will satisfy $d(x, y) = d(y, z) = d(z, x)$. Concerning the orientation, remember that in Definition 3.1 we had two possible orientations for a triangle, positive or negative. In $\mathcal{K}$ we will have much more possible orientations since the orientation of a triangle will depend on its orientation in each non hyperbolic coordinate (in hyperbolic coordinates, the projection is just a point and thus has only one possible orientation). Suppose that among the $\mathcal{X}_i$'s forming $\mathcal{K}$, m of them are not Gromov hyperbolic (for $0 \leq m \leq n$), and set

$$I = \{(a_1, \dots, a_m) | a_i \in \{+, -\}\},$$

we then say that an equilateral triangle x, y, z has orientation $j \in I$ if in the non hyperbolic components $\mathcal{X}_i$ the triangle x_i, y_i, z_i has the orientation given by a_i for $i = 1, \dots, m$.

Lemma 4.8. *For any $\delta_0 > 0$ there exists a $d > 0$ such that the following is true:*

- 1) *For any $x, y, z \in \mathcal{K}$ there exists x', y', z' an equilateral triangle in $\mathcal{K}$ such that the paths $xx'y'y$, $yy'z'z$ and $zz'x'x$ are d -paths.*
- 2) *For any two equilateral triangles x, y, z and a, b, c in $\mathcal{K}$ of same orientation and such that $d(x, a)$, $d(y, b)$ are both less than δ_0 , the triangles x, z, c and y, z, c are d -retractable.*

Proof. 1) For any $i = 1, \dots, n$ it exists an equilateral triangle x'_i, y'_i, z'_i in $\mathcal{X}_i$ such that the paths $x_i x'_i y'_i y_i$, $y_i y'_i z'_i z_i$ and $z_i z'_i x'_i x_i$ are δ_i -paths. Indeed, this is because of Lemma 3.6 in [8] and Lemma 3.2 in case $\mathcal{X}_i$ is $X_{\mathbf{K}}$ for $\mathbf{K} = \mathbf{R}, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{H}$ or $\mathbf{O}$, because of Section 3 in [10] in case $\mathcal{X}_i$ is an $\tilde{A}_2$ -type building and trivially in case $\mathcal{X}_i$ is a hyperbolic space. Now, setting $x' = (x'_1, \dots, x'_n)$, $y' = (y'_1, \dots, y'_n)$ and $z' = (z'_1, \dots, z'_n)$ we see that by construction the triangle x', y', z' is equilateral and that the path $xx'y'y$ is a d -paths for any $d \geq \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_i$ since

$$\begin{aligned} d(x, x') + d(x', y') + d(y', y) &= \sum_{i=1}^n d_i(x_i, x'_i) + d_i(x'_i, y'_i) + d_i(y'_i, y_i) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n (d_i(x_i, y_i) + \delta_i) \leq d(x, y) + d \end{aligned}$$

and similarly for the paths $yy'z'z$ and $zz'x'x$.

2) Here we have to find a $d \geq 0$ and u, v in $\mathcal{K}$ such that the paths xuz, zuc and cux as well as the paths yvz, zvc and cvy are d -paths. But for any $i = 1, \dots, n$, the triangles x_i, y_i, z_i and a_i, b_i, c_i are equilateral triangles and thus because of Lemma 3.7 in [8] and Lemma 3.2 in case $\mathcal{X}_i$ is $X_{\mathbf{K}}$ for $\mathbf{K} = \mathbf{R}, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{H}$ or $\mathbf{O}$, trivially in case $\mathcal{X}_i$ is an $\tilde{A}_2$ -type building or a hyperbolic space, the triangles x_i, z_i, c_i and y_i, z_i, c_i are δ_i -retractable, that is there exists $\delta_i \geq 0$ and points u_i and v_i so that the paths $x_i u_i z_i, z_i u_i c_i$ and $c_i u_i x_i$ as well as the paths $y_i v_i z_i, z_i v_i c_i$ and $c_i v_i y_i$ are δ_i -paths. Now the points $u = (u_1, \dots, u_n)$ and $v = (v_1, \dots, v_n)$ are the sought points on which the triangles x, z, c and y, z, c retract, for $d \geq \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_i$. Indeed, let us check that for the path xuz :

$$\begin{aligned} d(x, u) + d(u, z) &= \sum_{i=1}^n (d_i(x_i, u_i) + d(u_i, z_i)) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n (d_i(x_i, z_i) + \delta_i) \leq d(x, z) + d. \end{aligned}$$

and similarly for the paths zuc and cux as well as the paths yvz, zvc and cvy . $\square$

The following lemma is the analogue of a part of Theorem 3.3 in [8].

Lemma 4.9. *Let Γ be a discrete cocompact subgroup of the isometry group of $\mathcal{K}$, and $Z \subset \mathcal{K}$ be a Γ -invariant uniform net. Let X be a free Γ -space and $\theta : X \rightarrow Z$ be a Γ -equivariant map. Endow X with the distance*

$$\theta^*(d)(x, y) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x = y \\ 1 + d(\theta(x), \theta(y)) & \text{if } x \neq y \end{cases}$$

where d is the induced distance of $\mathcal{K}$ on Z . Then the pair (X, Γ) satisfies property (K) .

Proof. Take $\delta \geq 4R_Z + d$ (for d as in Lemma 4.8). We first have to define the Γ -invariant subsets of X^3 . Let us consider I as explained in Definition 4.7, that is, I is a set of indices running along the possible orientations of equilateral triangles in $\mathcal{K}$. For any $i \in I$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}'_i = \{(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) \in Z^3 \mid & \text{it exists } (a, b, c) \in \mathcal{K}^3 \text{ equilateral triangle} \\ & \text{with } d(\alpha, a) \leq R_Z, d(\beta, b) \leq R_Z, d(\gamma, c) \leq R_Z\} \end{aligned}$$

In other words, $\mathcal{T}'_i$ is the set of triples of Z which are not too far from an equilateral triangle, and since Γ acts on $\mathcal{K}$ by isometries, the sets $\mathcal{T}'_i$ are Γ -invariant. We then set, for any $i \in I$:

$$\mathcal{T}_i = \theta^{-1}(\mathcal{T}'_i).$$

Since θ is Γ -equivariant, $\mathcal{T}_i$ is Γ -invariant for any $i \in I$. Let us explain why then (X, Γ) satisfy property (K) . Because of the distance defined on X , it is enough to prove (K_a) and (K_b) for Z and the sets $\mathcal{T}_i'$.

(K_a) :

Take $(x, y, z) \in Z^3$, we have to show that there exists (α, β, γ) in some $\mathcal{T}_i$ so that the triple (x, y, z) retracts on (α, β, γ) . But because of part a) of Lemma 4.8, we know that there exists $(x', y', z') \in \mathcal{K}^3$, forming an equilateral triangle and so that the triple x, y, z retracts on x', y', z' . Now Z being a uniform net in $\mathcal{K}$, there exists α, β, γ three points of Z with $d(\alpha, x') \leq R_Z$, $d(\beta, y') \leq R_Z$ and $d(\gamma, z') \leq R_Z$, so that the triple (α, β, γ) belongs to $\mathcal{T}_i'$ for some $i \in I$. We compute:

$$\begin{aligned} & d(x, \alpha) + d(\alpha, \beta) + d(\beta, y) \\ & \leq d(x, x') + d(x', \alpha) + d(\alpha, x') + d(x', y') + d(y', \beta) + d(\beta, y') + d(y', y) \\ & \leq d(x, x') + d(x', y') + d(y', y) + 4R_Z \leq d(x, y) + d + 4R_Z \leq \delta \end{aligned}$$

and similarly for the paths $y\beta\gamma z$ and $z\gamma\alpha x$.

(K_b) :

Take $i \in I$ and four points in Z defining two triples in $\mathcal{T}_i'$, say (α, β, γ) and (α, β, γ') . We have to prove that both triangles α, γ, γ' and β, γ, γ' are δ -retractable. By definition of $\mathcal{T}_i'$ we can find two equilateral triangles a, b, c and x, y, z such that

$$d(\alpha, a) \leq R_Z, d(\beta, b) \leq R_Z, d(\gamma', c) \leq R_Z$$

and

$$d(\alpha, x) \leq R_Z, d(\beta, y) \leq R_Z, d(\gamma, z) \leq R_Z$$

so that obviously $d(a, x) \leq 2R_Z$ and $d(b, y) \leq 2R_Z$ and thus applying part b) of Lemma 4.8 we have the existence of a $d \geq 0$, and two points u and v in $\mathcal{K}$ so that the paths xuz, zuc and cux as well as the paths yvz, zvc and cvy are d -paths. Again, Z being a uniform net in $\mathcal{K}$, we can find u' and v' in Z at respective distances less than R_Z to u and v . We claim that the paths $\alpha u' \gamma, \gamma u' \gamma'$ and $\gamma' u' \alpha$ as well as the paths $\beta v' \gamma, \gamma v' \gamma'$ and $\gamma' v' \beta$ are δ -paths:

$$\begin{aligned} & d(\alpha, u') + d(u', \gamma) \\ & \leq d(\alpha, x) + d(x, u) + d(u, u') + d(u', u) + d(u, z) + d(z, \gamma) \\ & \leq 4R_Z + d(x, u) + d(u, z) \leq d(x, z) + d + 4R_Z \\ & \leq d(x, \alpha) + d(\alpha, \gamma) + d(\gamma, z) + d + 4R_Z \\ & \leq d(\alpha, \gamma) + (d + 6R_Z) \leq d(\alpha, \gamma) + \delta \end{aligned}$$

and similarly for the other paths. $\square$

Now, if under the assumptions of this lemma we furthermore assume that $\sharp\theta^{-1}(z) \leq N$ (i. e. θ has uniformly bounded fibers) we use Remark 4.2 and Lemma 4.5 to deduce that X has property (H) . We now can apply Theorem 4.4, as follows: Z is a Γ -invariant uniform net in $\mathcal{K}$ and let $Z = \coprod_{j \in J} \Gamma x_j$ its partition in Γ -orbits. Then with $X = \coprod_{i \in I} \Gamma$ and θ the obvious orbit map and with $\{\mathcal{T}_i\}_{i \in I}$ as defined in the previous lemma we get:

Theorem 4.10. *Let Γ be a discrete group acting by isometries on $\mathcal{K}$ and with uniformly bounded stabilizers on some Γ -invariant uniform net. Then Γ has property (RD) .* $\square$

If Γ is a cocompact lattice of isometries on $\mathcal{K}$, it is enough to take $Z = \Gamma x_0$ and $X = \Gamma$, so Γ has property (RD) .

Remark 4.11. If one is only interested in cocompact lattices in the isometry group of a product of hyperbolic spaces the proof of property (RD) then becomes much simpler. Indeed, denote by $\mathcal{H}$ a finite product of hyperbolic spaces, Γ a cocompact lattice in its isometry group and $X = \Gamma x_0$ for some $x_0 \in \mathcal{H}$. We showed that X has property (H), so it remains to show that any triple of points is δ -retractable, but this is a special case of Lemma 4.8 part 1). We can conclude using Proposition 2.3 of [8].

Notice that for this work we have established property (RD) for Γ a cocompact lattice of isometries on $\mathcal{K}$, endowed with the ℓ^1 combination of the distances, and this implies Theorem 0.1 since $\text{Iso}(\mathcal{X}_1) \times \cdots \times \text{Iso}(\mathcal{X}_n) \subset \text{Iso}(\mathcal{K}, \ell^1)$. The arguments used for the proof fail for other combinations of the distances.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Ferry, A. Ranicki, J. Rosenberg. *Novikov conjectures, Index theorems and rigidity*. London Mathematical Society, LNS 226 (1993).
- [2] H. Freudenthal. *Oktaven, Ausnahmegruppen und Oktavengeometrie*. Geometriae Dedicata, 19, pp 1–73, 1985.
- [3] H. Freudenthal. *Zur Ebenen Oktavengeometrie*. Neder. Akad. van Wetenschappen, 56, pp195–200, 1953.
- [4] U. Haagerup. *An example of nonnuclear C^* -algebra which has the metric approximation property*. Inv. Math. **50** (1979), 279–293.
- [5] P. de la Harpe. *Groupes Hyperboliques, algèbres d’opérateurs et un théorème de Jolissaint*. C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I **307** (1988), 771–774.
- [6] S. Helgason. *Differential Geometry, Lie Groups, and Symmetric Spaces*. Pure and Applied Mathematics, **80**. Academic Press, Inc., 1978. ISBN 0-12-338460-5
- [7] P. Jolissaint. *Rapidly decreasing functions in reduced C^* -algebras of groups*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **317** (1990), 167–196.
- [8] V. Lafforgue. *A proof of property (RD) for discrete cocompact subgroups of $SL_3(\mathbf{R})$* . Journal of Lie Theory. **10** (2000), 255–277.
- [9] V. Lafforgue. *Une démonstration de la conjecture de Baum-Connes pour les groupes réductifs sur un corps p -adique et pour certains groupes discrets possédant la propriété (T)*. C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sr. I Math. **327** (1998), no. 5, 439–444.
- [10] J. Ramagge, G. Robertson, T. Steger. *A Haagerup inequality for $\tilde{A}_1 \times \tilde{A}_1$ and $\tilde{A}_2$ buildings*. GAFA, Vol. 8 pp702–731, 1988.
- [11] R. D. Schafer. *An introduction to Nonassociative Algebras*. Academic Press Inc., 1966.
- [12] T. Springer. *Octonions, Jordan algebras and exceptional groups*. Springer Verlag Berlin Heidelberg New-York, ISBN: 3-540-6637-1
- [13] A. Valette. *An Introduction to the Baum-Connes Conjecture*. to be published by Birkhäuser, in the series “Lectures Notes in Mathematics ETH Zürich”.

ETHZ, D-MATH, RÄMISTRASSE 101, 8092 ZÜRICH
E-mail address: `indira@math.ethz.ch`